DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 358 SP 033 268

AUTHOR Weiner, Lois
TITLE Re-Examining the History of the 1960s.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Civil Rights; Collective Bargaining; Decentralization; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Historiography; *Politics of Education; Public School Teachers; *Teacher Militancy; Teacher Strikes; *Union Members; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS 1960s; New York (New York); *Union Recognition; *United Federation of Teachers

ABSTRACT

This paper revisits the educational reform movement of the 1960s, focusing on the role of teacher unionism and its impact on the politics of education during that decade. Historians of education have failed to combine information about the social composition and political culture of the teaching force, as well as the political culture of the labor movement in which teacher unions developed. This document suggests some ways in which teachers and their organizations can be included in the historiography of educational reform in the 1960's. Events in New York City from 1960 to 1968 are used to argue the point, beginning with the 1960 and 1962 strikes of New York City teachers for collective bargaining and culminating in 1968 shortly before the newly created bargaining agent, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), conducted a series of strikes. Focusing on the UFT's formation and development illuminates how the civil rights movement, the Vietnam war, the political culture of New York City's labor movement, the consciousness of female elementary school teachers, and the school decentralization issue all contributed to the series of strikes. The place of teachers and their organizations in education and educational reform are critically important topics of investigation, both for concerns about contemporary educational reform and for a thorough understanding of the history of education. (LL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 336358

# RE-EXAMINING THE HISTORY OF THE 1960'S

PAPER PRESENTED TO THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
CHICAGO, APRIL 1991

LOIS WEINER
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, CURRICULUM, AND INSTRUCTION
JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE
JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Weiner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 033 268

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# RE-EXAMINING THE HISTORY OF THE 1960'S *

More than twenty years ago, Maxine Greene observed that in writing history of education "what seems most fascinating (and problematic)... is the whole business of keeping tabs on the multiple relationships among institutions (including schools), accumulated knowledge, random ideas, technologies, faiths, myths, interest groups, and the presentations which are art, at various moments of history."[1] This is the same problem of developing "a credible conceptual scheme" for history that Alan Brinkley argues the New Left has thus far failed to solve, despite its scholarly contributions and influence in the last twenty years. [2]

In their work on teachers and teacher organizations, Julia Wrigley, and Ira Katznelson and Margaret Weir have perhaps most successfully synthesized the political, economic, and social history that is needed to deal with class, gender, and culture in the history of education.[3] However there are indications that their historiographic contribution is being ignored as the history of educational reform in the 1960's is written.

For example, Lowe and Kantor have argued that the key to understanding the period's reforms is analysis of how the state shaped protest by the civil rights movement.[4] Their framework does not mention teachers, teacher unionism, nor its impact on

---

* The author wishes to thank Bruce Markens, who obtained and loaned unpublished material about the early history of the United Federation of Teachers which suggested the topic of the paper and provided critical information.

the politics of education. Yet, during the decade, more than half a million American teachers, one out of every four elementary and secondary teachers, engaged in work stoppages. By winning collective bargaining, teachers and their organizations significantly altered the political balance of power in education, first in New York City, then in the largest urban school districts.[5]

Contemporaneous accounts and more recent historical treatments, such as Ravitch's The Great School Wars and The Troubled Crusade, do not incorporate accounts of the union's formation and early years into a comprehensive explanation of the events swirling around decentralization of the New York City schools.[6] When sociological and political information about the union is combined with material about the civil rights movement, quite a different picture of events emerges, and with it, new questions.[7]

As I will attempt to demonstrate, in ignoring teachers and teacher unionism, the frameworks employed thus far by historians of education in the 1960's fail to take into account the "multiple relationships" of which Maxine Greene wrote; they are creating a tableau shorn of insights which feminist and labor historians have brought to our understanding of education in other periods, especially Chicago in the early part of the century.

Historians of education have failed to combine information about the social composition and political culture of the

teaching force, as well as the political culture of the labor movement in which teacher unions developed. Even Katznelson and Weir make no reference to teacher unionism in discussing the 1960's, instead discussing educational reform exclusively in terms of race issues. Their ommission of teacher unionism in its second rebirth contrasts sharply with their comprehensive examination of teacher unionism early in the century.

They seem to imply that a single historic moment in cities' geographic and political organization nurtured a progressive alliance between teachers and the labor movement---and that moment is irreproducible. Their theory that balkanization of cities into ethnic enclaves fragmented class organization and class consciousness seems to rule out the possibility that the reborn teacher union movement could have, anywhere, duplicated the synergy between the Chicago Teachers Federation and the Chicago Federation of Labor fifty years earlier. Even if Katznelson and Weir's theory is correct, using their framework to analyze events in New York City nonetheless encourages h'storians to take up the political ideas and social and economic forces which nurtured teacher unionism's second emergence and shaped the organizational forms the unions assumed.

In this paper I will offer suggestions of the ways in which including teachers and their organizations in the historiography of education alters the picture of the 1960's being sketched by Lowe, Kantor, and others. I will use events in New York City from 1960 to 1968 as a case in point, beginning with the 1960 and

1962 strikes of New York City teachers for collective bargaining, and culminating in 1968, shortly before the newly created bargaining agent, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), conducted a series of strikes which have come to be known as the Ocean Hill-Brownsville strikes.

I will argue that focusing on the UFT's formation and development illuminates how the civil rights movement, the Vietnam war, the political culture of the city's labor movement, and the consciousness of the female elementary school teachers all contributed to the Ocean Hill-Brownsville confrontation, which to many observers was the graveyard of progressive educational reform in the 1960's. The conflict between the leaders of the UFT, with a mostly white membership, and black and Puerto Rican advocates of a plan to decentralize administrative control of the city schools, resulted in a long, bitter confrontation named after the Brooklyn neighborhoods of Ocean Hill and Brownsville where the dispute eruped.

Debate about the strike's purposes and effects stretched far beyond New York City limits and echoed for years thereafter.[8] Ocean Hill-Brownsville became a synonym for the collapse of hope that teachers, parents of minority students, and community activists could work together to reform the schools.[9]

## RE-EXAMINING THE HISTORY OF THE 1960'S

Clearly, the dynamic relationship between a militant, class-conscious teacher union movement and broader labor organization that produced a powerful political movement for educational

reform in Chicago at the beginning of the century never materialized in New York City or the other large cities which comprised the first beachhead of teacher unionism in the 1960's. But addressing three closely related questions about New York City teachers and their organizations demonstrates how including teacher unionism in a historiographic framework deepens our understanding of events.

First, how did the social composition of the teaching force shape the union's development? Next, how did the political culture of the city's labor movement influence the union's formation and its relationship to the civil rights movement? Finally, how did the Vietnam war - and opposition to it among the city's teachers - affect educational reform in the city during this period?

The Unionization of Teachers, by Stephen Cole, a sociologist, is an indispensable resource in pursuing all of these questions.[10] Cole examined the demographics of the teaching force, motivations for unionizing, and interviewed leaders of all the organizations which attempted to speak for New York City's 65,000 public school teachers.

Cole's study determined that religion was a significant factor: "militant teachers," those who supported the first two strikes in 1960 and 1962, which were held for collective bargaining rights, were almost twice as likely to be Jewish as teachers who did not support both illegal strikes. Jewish teachers were more likely to be Democrats and sympathetic to

unionism in general, and Cole linked their sympathy to unionism to the relatively open acceptance of left-wing ideas in the city's political culture.

These findings contrast sharply with Wayne Urban's conclusions about why teacher unionism succeeded in New York City. Urban has argued that fifty years earlier, that the predominantly Jewish - and radical - membership of the UFT's antecedent, the Teachers League, was an impediment to recruiting Anglo-Saxon and Irish Catholic teachers who staffed elementary schools. Until a "tough, pragmatic trade unionism under Albert Shanker" was created, by implication, one less radical and less parochial in its composition and concerns, teacher unionism was doomed to be peripheral.[11]

Urban's conclusions about both periods are challenged, by Cole's findings in the 1960's and by Lana Muraskin's study of the the Teachers Union (TU), as the League was called when it became Local 5 of the American Federation of Teachers. Muraskin explains how the TU demonstrated a single-minded concern about high school teachers by supporting a unified salary schedule for all teachers based on length of training, not service. Because elementary school teachers had less academic preparation than the secondary teachers, the TU's program counterposed the economic interests of the high school teachers to those of elementary school teachers.

Religion and ethnicity were important in teacher politics but had a far more complex relationship than Urban's analysis allows. TU's Jewish membership and leadership opposed any

displays of religious or ethnic identity, insisting that "only in an ethnically sterile school system would union members rise to the top." Furthermore, TU members supported the system's centralization and rationalization of authority for similar reasons, aims opposed by elementary school teachers.[12]

Muraskin's work suggests the importance of examining how gender compounded the structural divisons between high school and elementary school teachers in forming teachers' consciousness. Cole's work confirms the continued importance of these divisions, as well as their relation to gender differences. In the 1960's, male teachers were almost twice as likely to be "militant," which Cole attributed to the diferences between male and female teachers' class status. Sixty percent of female teachers in a 1960 census report had husbands in higher-paying, more prestigious occupations, while fifty-four percent of male teachers had spouses who were not employed. However, elementary school teachers were far more likely to be "militant," that is to support the first two strikes, because of dissatisfaction with working conditions. They were far less disturbed about their prestige than their counterparts in the high schools and unlikely to strike because of this concern. Thus, female elementary school teachers were by reason of class less likely to strike, but unhappiness with conditions in schools was the primary motivation for many to overcome their class biases against unionism and support the fledgling teachers union in illegal strikes.

Cole's findings demonstrate that the relationship between

gender and militancy is more complicated than some feminist analyses of teaching's nurturing aspects allow. For instance, one writer has argued that the helping professions are a "compassion trap" for women in which they are manipulated to help maintain an exploitative status quo in the society.[13] Yet, in New York City, the elementary school teachers, whose work is far more similar to parenting than that of high school teachers, were mobilized to challenge the status quo precisely because of their inability to perform their nurturing functions.

Cole concluded that the more a staff contained teachers who were Jewish Democrats, lower-class in origin, male and young, the more likely it was to be militant and pro-union. This profile fit junior high schools more than the other divisions and indeed through the 1962 strike, union sentiment was strongest in the junior high schools. Cole conjectures that junior high school teachers were more likely to be militant because they were younger and had less teaching experience but confronted the most difficult teaching conditions and discipline problems with students. High schools, on the other hand, could expel students at age 16. In both working conditions and status, high school teachers were privileged vis a vis their colleagues in junior highs.

Another reason for teacher unionism's greatest strength in the junior high schools was that their high school counterparts were more likely to belong to the High School Teachers Association (HSTA). Although HSTA leaders actually spearheaded

the 1960 and 1962 strikes, the HSTA's role has been ignored. Most scholarship about teacher unionism in New York has focused on conflict between the Teachers Guild and the Teachers Union, organizations which reflected the bitter ideological warfare between socialists and Communists. However, examining the HSTA raises different, equally vital questions.

In November, 1960 5,000 teachers out of 60,000 conducted a one-day strike for collective bargaining rights. In April 1962, after several independent groups coalesced to form the United Federation of Teachers, New York City teachers waged another strike for collective bargaining; this time 22,000 teachers participated, 40% of the teachers in junior high schools, 28% of the high school teachers, and 20% of the elementary school staff. The UFT, which soon after won an election for bargaining agent, was headed by leaders of two organizations, the Teachers Guild and a segment of the HSTA which had split over coalescing with the Guild. Although the HSTA's leadership ultimately lost all organizational influence in the UFT, from 1962 until 1967 it remained the most effective opposition to the Guild faction, which quickly solidified its control of the union apparatus.

The HSTA's craft union orientation, its isolation from organized labor, indeed, its hostility to it, as well as its commitment to keep high school teachers in a separate organization, uninfected by elementary school teachers, doomed the HSTA to extinction. It could not match the financial and political clout which the Guild, with its connections to

socialist unions and the New York City labor council, could bring to bear on educational politics. However, labor's assistance came at a price: Cole describes how the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO donated organizing grants and loans to the UFT and the City Labor Council supplied financial and political assistance in exchange for the Guild's promise not to strike. Organized labor opposed both the 1960 and 1962 strikes.

The HSTA and the Guild were both led by males and represented the militants in junior highs and high schools. Who represented elementary school teachers? Unfortunately, no studies of the UFT have examined this question, but it is, I believe, essential for understanding how the Guild consolidated its control. The UFT won collective bargaining without a sustained struggle because of labor's clout in the Democratic party, which controlled city politics. In this brief time, the junior high schools were organized; union questions had long been debated by high school teachers. However, the elementary schools remained a backwater of union organization: only one-fifth of the elementary school teachers supported the 1962 strike. The struggle for collective bargaining was a giant wave which washed over the grammar schools and then receded, leaving little structural trace of its existence. Because of its craft union orientation, the HSTA and the leaders who broke from it to support the UFT, were completely isolated from the city's elementary school teachers, who subsequently provided the Guild faction with a bloc of passive votes.

Murray Hoffinger's unpublished thesis supports this analysis. In 1962 the major oppostion to the Guild, organized as the Unity caucus, was a group calling itself SPUR, which was headed by the HSTA leaders who had joined the UFT. The union's executive board, dominated by Unity members, denied SPUR access to lists of delegates and chapter leaders, and Albert Shanker, heading Unity, carried the election 7,000 to 4,000, winning 63% of the votes. In the elementary schools the margin was 2,600 to 1,000, a margin of 72%. This voting pattern continued for the next three years, though SPUR charged that the UFT administration had "indiscriminately purged valuable teacher talent from positions of UFT leadership" and carried out a "scorched earth policy" against teachers who would not "conform to a controlled point of view."[14]

In 1966 the union administration succeeded in changing the voting procedure to allow balloting for slates, with no provision for proportional representation of minorities. This new system presented voters with a choice: either vote for a slate for officers or check off individual names, including those for the 600 delegates who represent the union at state and national AFT conventions. The results in this election were dramatically different: 67% of all ballots were slate; Unity won 13,000 to 5,000, a margin of 72%. The totals within each division were more revealing: Unity carried the high schools 2,400 to 1,800, a margin of 57% and swept the elementary schools by 6,000 to 1,300, with 82% of the votes. Moreover, the proportion of votes changed

dramtically: the elementary school and high school division had approximately the same number of teachers, but only 23% of the votes were from the high schools; 40% were from the elementary schools. Slate voting together with support from the elementary school division seemed to cement Unity's control over the union apparatus.

However, in 1967, the year after these changes were made, the union's city-wide representative body voted to oppose U.S. policy in Vietnam, thereby repudiating Shanker's unwavering support of the Vietnam war, overturning, at least in this instance, his hold on the union structure.[15] This event supports Cole's argument that internal politics played a significant role in the union leadership's position on decentralization. Union leaders admitted to Cole privately that what was at stake in the decentralization conflict was that "the union itself might be forced to decentralize."[16] That process threatened the union's political power, as well as Unity's domination of the union administration, which was already challenged by growing anti-war sentiment.

Unity members were apprehensive about the changes loss of control would bring because, unlike the HSTA leaders interviewed who preferred teaching to union work, Unity leaders all acknowledged they enjoyed union work more than teaching. As one Unity member explained to Cole, as a full-time staffer he could "go out and eat in a good restaurant. I can also order a martini before my lunch." It's a "different kind of life than a school,

which means punching a clock, meeting forty kids, and meeting another 35 kids."[17]

Taking into account the union's internal politics as a factor in its positions on educational issues is critical, as the Hoffinger and Cole data demonstrate. The picture their data suggests, however, is quite different from the portrait which Diane Ravitch presents in The Great School Wars. Ravitch analyzes the battle over decentralization as yet another confrontation in the inevitable series of conflicts between ethnic groups who dominate the education establishment and those vying for control. In this battle, the "fourth school war," the primarily white, Jewish UFT membership was threatened by advocates of black and Puerto Rican demands for political control of the schools. Internal union politics were important only insofar as the leadership's more liberal political attitudes prevailed over the membership's proclivities. The linch-pin in this argument is the union executive board's 30-2 endorsement of Mayor Lindsay's civilian review board of police and the endorsement's far narrower (486-375) passage at a city-wide meeting of the union's representative body, the delegate assembly.[18]

How can we reconcile these two drastically different accounts of the conditions precipitating the clash over decentralization? To begin the process, we need to examine negotiations for the 1967 contract. In 1967 the UFT attempted to use contract negotiations to expand funding for its More Effective Schools program (MES), a program to improve target

schools serving poor, minority students. MES called for decreasing class size dramatically, grouping students heterogeneously, providing additional supplies, materials, and support services, and involving parents and community members in school management. The Board of Education argued that the program was too expensive and because of reduced Federal spending was no longer affordable. In addition, some community activists questioned whether test scores of students in the pilot program had risen enough to justify the massive expenditures.[19] For some MES critics the program incorrectly located responsibility for academic failure on family and community, rather than placing the blame on the school system where, they argued, it belonged.

The union leadership was itself sharply divided over whether the union should accept a contract with an acceptable salary but without MES funding. Administrative decentralization of the school system was the Board's alternative to MES, and to win union support for the plan Mayor Lindsay floated a plan to have teachers participate on local school boards. Some Unity leaders saw in Lindsay's proposal the union's opportunity to forge a political alliance with parents and community activists:

> Under the present set up, although we can gain certain things for the teachers, we make no real dent in society...whereas if we took over the school system, or we partially took it over with the parents...then if we lacked funds we would go en masse and get funds because we would be a tremendous political group.[20]

Agreeing with Albert Shanker that the union should not veer from traditional labor-management relations, a majority of

executive board members joined him in rejecting any role for the union but negotiations over salary, benefits, and working conditions, narrowly defined. They rejected the proposal to have teachers share power on local school boards and a continued battle for MES. For some Unity leaders, the union's failure to pursue MES was a crushing disappointment because they believed

> ...there are many teachers who saw the teacher union movement as more than a union movement---who saw it as changing the nature of the labor movement and going beyond that ---really changing the nature of the schools, giving the schools over to the profession.[21]

Writing during the MES controversy, David Cohen linked the problem of reduced federal school aid to the failure of school integration, predicting the collision between the UFT and decentralization advocates. He argued that both community control and decentralization were strategies designed to substitute for racial integration, in response to the civil rights movement's failure to integrate the city's schools. Cohen argued that decentralization ignored the dire need for massive new resource reallocation and dampened prospects for mounting a popular challenge to the reductions in federal aid.[22]

The union's MES strategy also accepted, implicitly, segregated schooling, and in so doing ignored the barriers to learning inherent in schools segregated by race and class, Cohen wrote. Even vast amounts of aid poured into ghetto schools would scarcely begin to compensate for their social isolation. Thus neither MES nor decentralization could succeed in altering conditions, because in bowing to integration's defeat, both

strategies sacrificed the political mainspring of a successful campaign to revise the nation's social and political priorities and the funds needed to improve ghetto schools.[23]

Cohen's contemporaneous reading of events dovetails with Lowe and Kantor's suggestion that the patterns of school politics in the 1960's were shaped by the black movement, the structure of the the state and the enactment of state-sponsored reforms.[24] But as I have attempted to demonstrate, this framework, presented as a model of social history, excludes perspectives of teachers, one of the "groups excluded from the inner workings of government [which] played a central role in shaping public events."[25]

Marvin Lazerson has argued that in the political battles over the schools at the turn of the century

> Teachers were caught in a complex struggle over their identity and roles. On the one hand, they were treated as workers, fought when they tried to organizae, and considered unworthy to have major roles in the shaping of educational policy. On the other hand, they were defined as professionals, requiring educational credentials, and with a great deal of autonomy over their classroom practices.[26]

The battles ended with a bargain struck: the educational system would treat teachers as valuable cogs in the machine that processed students, as long as teachers refrained from agitating for participation in decision-making and engaging in political organizing.

The political struggles over schooling sparked by the civil rights movement in the 1960's ignited conflicts about teachers' roles as educators, workers, and citizens, as the battles fifty years earlier had done. It may have been, as David Cohen argued,

that the clash between the two most powerful advocates of educational reform, the civil rights movement and the burgeoning teacher union movement, in the nation's largest city became inevitable once the union failed to champion ---and win---racial integration. However, analyzing events in these terms changes quite radically the questions historians search to answer.

Stephen Cole's study of the UFT ends in 1967; analagous scholarship needs to be done about the beliefs and actions of UFT members and leaders as the political battle over schooling ignited into a war. To what extent did the union members who successfully challenged Shanker's pro-war stance agree with the leadership's politics on decentralization and MES? Within the membership, how did race, class, and gender distinctions variously affect teachers' attitudes on the issue of the war, contract negotiations, and the decentralization plan? How did the political culture of the city's labor movement influence developments within the union and the leadership's external actions?

Writing in 1967, Maxine Greene noted that quality educational reform could not be achieved without the values which the "romantic" critics advocated, but would also be elusive "if teachers do not assert themselves as dignified human beings who can afford to respect the children in their classrooms because they have learned to respect themselves."[27] The place of teachers and their organizations in education and educational reform are critically important topics of investigation, both for

"presentist" concerns about contemporary educational reform and for a thorough understanding of what was and what might have been in the history of education.

1.Maxine Greene, Letter to the editor, History of Education Quarterly 6 (Winter 1966), 100.

2.Alan Brinkley, "Writing the History of Contemporary America: Dilemmas and Challenges," Daedalus 113 (Summer 1984), 121-142.

3.Julia Wrigley, Class Politics and Public Schools 1900-1950 (New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1982). Ira Katznelson and Margaret Weir, Schooling for All (New York: Basic Books, 1985).

4.Robert Lowe and Harvey Kantor,"Considerations on Writing the History of Educational Reform in the 1960s," Educational Theory 39 (Winter 1989), 1-9.

5. Lorraine McDonnell, "The Control of Political Change Within an Interest Group: The Case of the National Education Association," (Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 1975).

6. Diane Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

7.Richard T. LaPointe, "Ideology and Organization in Teacher Unionism," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976). Arthur E. Salz, "The Growth of Teacher Unionism in New York City, 1945-1962," (Ed.D. thesis, Columbia University, 1968). Stephen Cole, The Unionization of Teachers (New York: Praeger, 1969). Murray Hoffinger, "A Study of the Institutionalization of Opposition as One Factor of Oligarchical Inhibition," (Ph.D. thesis, New York University, 1969).

8.For a pointed exchange about the events leading directly to the strike, see Albert Shanker, "The Real Meaning of the New York City Teachers Strike," Phi Delta Kappan 50 (April 1969) and Stephen Zeluck, "The UFT Strike: Will It Destroy the AFT?" Phi Delta Kappan 50 (January 1969). Diane Ravitch, in a recapitulation of events which confirms Shanker's version, describes the strike at length in The Great School Wars. New York

City 1805 - 1973. Ira Glasser, author of the report on the strike issued by the New York Civil Liberties Union, analyzes events as Zeluck presents them, in "The Burden of Blame: A Report on the Ocean Hill-Brownsville School Controversy," Urban Education 4 (Summer 1969).

9.Carl A. Grant, "Education That is Multicultural for Urban Schools: Rationale and Recommendations," in Marvin J. Fruth and Booker Gardner, eds., 1978 Urban Conference Report (Madison: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling, 1979. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 185 218.

10.Stephen Cole, The Unionization of Teachers. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969).

11.Wayne J. Urban, Why Teachers Organized (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1982), 107.

12.Lana D. Muraskin, "The Interests of the Teachers Union, 1913-1935," in Educating an Urban People eds. Diane Ravitch and Ronald E. Goodenow (New York: Teachers College Press, 1981), 222.

13.Margaret Adams, "The Compassion Trap." In Women and Sexist Society, eds. Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran (New York: Basic Books, 1971).

14.Hoffinger, 86.

15.Hoffinger, ibid.

16.Cole, 194.

17.Cole, 180.

18.Diane Ravitch, The Great School Wars, "Racism and Reaction."

19.See "The Controversy Over the More Effective Schools: A Special Supplement," The Urban Review 2 (May 1968) for a description of the program and results of the evaluation conducted by the Center for Usrban Education, as well as rebuttals. Gloria Channon in "The More Effective Schools," The Urban Review 2 (February 1967) gives a first-person account of working in one MES site.

20.Cole, 193.

21.Cole, 194.

22.David K. Cohen, "Teachers Want What Children Need - Or Do They?" The Urban Review 2 (June 1968).

23.Ibid.

24.Lowe and Kantor.

25.Lowe and Kantor, 3.

26.Marvin Lazerson, "Teachers Organize: What Margaret Haley Lost," History of Education Quarterly 24, (Summer 1984), 270.

27.Maxine Greene, review of Changing Education and This Magazine Is about Schools. Harvard Educational Review 37, (Fall 1967), 674.